

like to point out an important protection the bill affords for the Roan Plateau in Colorado. These protections are of great importance to Congressmen SALAZAR and UDALL, as well as the people of Colorado and the Nation.

The Roan Plateau is also, though, as was suggested by our colleague from New Mexico, a highly important source of natural gas supply to the Nation and will remain so for the foreseeable future.

Mr. SALAZAR gives us an opportunity to address both issues. The language in the bill specifies that the restrictions on the drilling are prospective only and do not apply to private drilling activities. It does not apply to roads, rights-of-way access to privately held land or production. Nor does it apply to pipelines and infrastructure needed to transport natural gas across BLM land to access stem pipelines to transport the gas to the rest of the United States.

Roan area gas is of immense importance to the Nation, with an estimated 9 trillion cubic feet of gas reserves. California, my State, gets 24 percent of its natural gas from the Rocky Mountains, clean-burning natural gas which today is the fuel du jour. California is struggling, obviously, to come into compliance with clean air standards. This supply of natural gas is important.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, this does provide new energy sources, solar power, and renewable sources. I want to thank Chairman RAHALL and Congressman SALAZAR for their amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), who has been a leader in this area.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to talk about the importance of the legislation we are considering. There's nothing more important to America's economy and security than affordable, available energy, and we are today looking at legislation that doesn't deal with that.

Here is our current use of energy: We are 40 percent dependent on petroleum. We are in world short supply at the moment. The oil companies are reporting they are most frightened today because of the lack of oil availability in the world than they have ever remembered. Natural gas, 23 percent. Coal, 23 percent. Nuclear, 8 percent. Hydroelectric, 2.7 percent.

None of these major forms of energy will be enhanced or helped. They will be harmed. The legislation coming from the Natural Resources Committee will give us less petroleum and increase our dependence on foreign supply from unstable parts of the world.

Natural gas? Nothing. But it will give us less natural gas and make us, again, foreign dependent on foreign, from Canada.

Nothing to help coal.

We need an energy bill that gives us energy so our renewables can grow in order to meet some of our future needs.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time allotted to the Science and Technology Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3221, the New Direction for Energy Independence, National Security, and Consumer Protection Act. This bill will help our Nation make great strides in our efforts to simultaneously reduce our dependence on foreign energy and address global climate change. I am proud to join with my colleagues on the Science and Technology Committee under the leadership of Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL to contribute a very strong Science and Technology title to this bill.

This title authorizes funding for research in advanced, experimental energy technologies; marine renewable energy technologies to harness the power of ocean waves and currents; geothermal energy technologies, to tap into the enormous reservoir of heat stored within the earth; biofuels, to increase the amount of energy we can extract from our agricultural resources; solar energy technologies, to tap into the tremendous power of the sun; carbon capture and storage, to reduce the carbon footprint of coal-fired power plants; and, of course, global climate change.

□ 1145

Mr. Chairman, all of these important provisions to this legislation had bipartisan support within our committee. I look forward to Members' support of this legislation, and will continue to work with Members to make sure these great provisions go to the President's desk.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the Republican time for the Education and Labor Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3221, the Democrat Energy Scarcity Bill. Congress must act decisively to pass a balanced, comprehensive energy policy that creates more American-made energy, spurs good jobs, corrects our supply-and-demand imbalance, lowers prices for consumers, and strengthens America's ability to compete. But the bill before us today would do none of that. Instead of creating new energy supplies for consumers, they trap America's vast energy resources under ever-more bureaucratic red tape and punitive taxes that discourage domestic energy investments.

As senior Republican on the Education and Labor Committee, I rise in opposition not only against H.R. 3221's remarkable lack of any new energy,

but also against the sliver of the bill marked up out of the blue by our committee in June, the so-called "green jobs" provision in the bill.

I was chairman of our Postsecondary Subcommittee in 1998 when Members of both parties enacted the Workforce Investment Act, or WIA, to establish the system of one-stop career centers aimed at providing one convenient, central location to offer job training and related employment services. While these reforms have been successful, the WIA system is still hampered by often unnecessary bureaucracy that prevents it from being as effective as it could be for workers and their families.

In response to this, in the last Congress, the Republican-led House voted to further streamline and consolidate these programs. Today, rather than following suit, H.R. 3221 will add to the duplicative nature of these job training programs, all under the guise of "green jobs." Make no mistake: this marks a significant step backwards in our effort to streamline the delivery of job training services.

Through the green jobs provision in this bill, though they have garnered a great deal of attention from the media and Members, it was significant enough to garner the attention of the Department of Labor. In an analysis of the language we marked up in committee earlier this year, the agency noted that the new program created under this bill would duplicate assistance that is available already to help train workers under the Workforce Investment Act. As a result, should H.R. 3221 become law, it would mean more red tape, more bureaucracy, and more hurdles for job seekers.

At a time when Congress purports to be so interested in enhancing American competitiveness, making it more difficult for job providers and job seekers to become more competitive themselves, surely this is not a wise course of action.

This reverse in course at the heart of H.R. 3221 should not be taken lightly. But given the process that has brought us here, I fear it has been. The Education and Labor Committee never held a single hearing on it, outside stakeholders had little or no time to review it, and the bill had been purposely crafted outside the WIA reauthorization process.

However, to meet an artificial deadline for introduction of the Democrat Energy Scarcity Bill, our committee was forced to act hastily. This ill-considered process is especially discouraging because this fall our committee is expected to begin the process of reauthorizing the Workforce Investment Act. Indeed, that process is the appropriate venue for consideration of the green jobs language considered in the bill before us today.

If we did follow this more responsible process on the green jobs language, there are a number of questions Members could and should ask about it.